



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/715,709	11/18/2003	Robert A. Relyea	60001.318US01	5419
27488	7590	09/24/2007		
MERCHANT & GOULD (MICROSOFT)			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 2903			KANG, INSUN	
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/24/2007	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/715,709

Applicant(s)

RELYEA ET AL.

Examiner

Insun Kang

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2193

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responding to Applicant's response filed on 6/26/2007.
2. As per applicant's request, claims 12-18 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

***Double Patenting***

3. The Terminal Disclosure filed on 6/26/2007 has been accepted.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

4. The rejection to claims 12-18 has been withdrawn due to the amendment to the claims.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5, 7-12, and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bray ("XML Namespaces by Example, 1999) in view of Enns et al. (US 2002/0065110, published on 5/30/2002) hereafter Enns.

Per claim 1:

Art Unit: 2193

Bray discloses:

A method for mapping a tag in a markup language (ML) document to a class using namespaces, comprising: analyzing a tag in the ML document; referencing a definition file location attribute in the ML document, (i.e. page 1, see line 1-7 of the XML code) wherein the definition file location attribute is related to the tag (i.e., page 1, see lines 1-4 of XML code); retrieving a definition file associated with the definition file location attribute (i.e., page 1, see lines 1-2 of XML code); referencing a namespace related to the tag within the definition file to determine the class associated with the tag (i.e., page 1, see paragraph 4 lines 1-3).

Bray does not explicitly teach locating the class in an assembly such that the tag is mapped to the class. However, Enns teaches it was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to allow a user to attach actions to a namespace as taught by Enns (paragraph 0067-0068). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify Bray's disclosed system to incorporate the teachings of Enns. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to allow a user to attach actions to a namespace.

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bray teaches: wherein analyzing a tag further comprises analyzing the tags in linear order as listed in the ML document (i.e. page 1, the XML code).

Per claim 3:

Art Unit: 2193

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bray teaches:

wherein analyzing a tag further comprises reading a prefix corresponding to the namespace related to the tag (i.e. page 1, paragraph 4 lines 1-3 ).

Per claim 4:

Bray discloses: defining the namespace using the prefix, wherein the prefix maps to an extensible markup language namespace (i.e. “the elements prefixed with xdc are associated with a namespace,” page 1, paragraph 4 line 1). Enns further discloses: the definition file maps the extensible markup language namespace to a common language runtime namespace and the assembly (paragraph 0067-0068).

Per claim 5:

The rejection of claim 3 is incorporated, and further, Bray teaches:

wherein the prefix is defined in the ML documents (i.e. “the elements prefixed with xdc are associated with a namespace,” page 1, paragraph 4 line 1).

Per claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bray teaches:

wherein retrieving a definition file further comprises retrieving the definition file from a network location specified by definition file location attribute (i.e. the XML code in page 1).

Per claim 8:

Art Unit: 2193

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Enns discloses: locating the class in an assembly further comprises locating the class in a dynamic link library, the dynamic link library comprising classes of functions associated with the namespace (paragraph 0067-0068).

Per claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bray teaches: generating the ML document, the ML document comprising the tag and the definition file location attribute (i.e. the XML code in page 1, comprising tags and xmlns).

Per claim 10:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Enns teaches: wherein the definition file comprises a list of the namespaces, schemas and assemblies associated with the class related to the namespace (i.e. paragraph 0067-0068).

Per claim 11:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further, Bray teaches: wherein the namespace of the definition file is associated with a property within an element of the ML document (i.e. xmlns, the XML code in page 1).

Per claims 12 and 14-18, they are the medium versions of claims 1-5 and 7-11, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-5 and 7-11 above.

Art Unit: 2193

Per claims 19-20, they are the system versions of claims 1-4, respectively, and are rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 1-4 above.

7. Claims 6 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bray ("XML Namespaces by Example, 1999), in view of Enns et al. (US 2002/0065110, published on 5/30/2002) hereafter Enns, and further in view of Chao et al. (US 2004/0103199) hereafter Chao.

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and further:

Bray and Enns do not explicitly teach determining whether the definition file is available locally in a cache, and if not available, storing the retrieved definition file in the cache. However, Chao teaches it was known in the pertinent art, at the time applicant's invention was made, to allow a user to cache the appropriate data (i.e. paragraph 0059). It would have been obvious for one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosed system of Bray and Enns to incorporate the teachings of Chao. The modification would be obvious because one having ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to perform a faster retrieval by using a cache (i.e. paragraph 0059).

Per claim 13, it is the medium version of claim 6, respectively, and is rejected for the same reasons set forth in connection with the rejection of claim 6 above.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-20 under 103(a) based on Bray in view of Jones have been fully considered and are persuasive. The applicant stated that Jones reference was owned by Microsoft Corporation at the time Applicant's invention was made (see remark 6). Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Bray, Enns, and Chao as addressed above.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Insun Kang whose telephone number is 571-272-3724. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MENG AI AN can be reached on 571-272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO



Art Unit: 2193

Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call  
800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

IK  
AU 2193

  
**MENG-A. T. AN**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2193**